

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

Figures 12-14 were amended to include the legend  
--PRIOR ART--.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

In light of the above amendments and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 12, and 16 are pending in this application.

In the office action, the Examiner stated that figures 12-14 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art--. Applicants have amended figures 12-14 to include the legend "PRIOR ART". Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gefvert (US 5,850,457) in view of Ruzicka (US 6,118,876), Lee (US 5,589,718), Siems (US 5,470,253), and Glover (US 3,824,524).

Independent claim 5, as amended herein, recites in part as follows:

"...a name of a corresponding audio output channel, a pair of polarities, and a colored mark that shows discernment corresponding to channels of the respective output terminal is displayed surrounding the respective output terminal on the back panel of the electronic apparatus whereat the audio signal output terminals are located..."  
(Emphasis added.)

Therefore, in the system of claim 5, a name of a corresponding audio output channel, a pair of polarities, and a colored mark are displayed on a respective output terminal. An example thereof is illustrated in figure 2 of the present application. As shown therein, an output terminal on the back panel of the electronic apparatus has a name corresponding to the channel, a pair of polarities, and a color mark.

It is respectfully submitted that the references, as applied by the Examiner, do not appear to disclose "a pair of polarities" being displayed surrounding the respective output

terminal, as in claim 5. Accordingly, independent claim 5 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Gefvert, Ruzicka, Lee (`718), Siems, and Glover.

For similar or somewhat similar reasons to those described above with regard to independent claim 5, independent claim 16 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Gefvert, Ruzicka, Lee (`718), Siems, and Glover.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gefvert, Ruzicka, Lee (`718), Siems, Glover, and further in view of Lee (US 5,984,717).


Claim 12 depends from claim 5, and, due to such dependency, is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Gefvert, Ruzicka, Lee (`718), Siems, and Glover for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on Lee (`717) to overcome the above-described deficiency of the Gefvert, Ruzicka, Lee (`718), Siems, and Glover combination. Accordingly, claim 5 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Gefvert, Ruzicka, Lee (`718), Siems, Glover, and Lee (`717).

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: April 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Mayush Singhvi  
Registration No.: 50,431  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant